

HANFORD OPENNESS WORKSHOPS PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT WORKING GROUP DRAFT PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT EVALUATION PLAN

It is important that the information collected is meaningful, but not so detailed or time consuming that meeting participants are unwilling to respond. Therefore, a multi-level strategy is required:

- General public at meetings—simple 3x5 report card to fill out. (Access to more detailed forms if desired);
- Highly involved stakeholder community—more detailed response form for public meetings, focus groups and workshops; and
- An evaluation team to review comments annually, look for progress and report to the public and DOE.

Reporting mechanisms and strategies could include:

- Periodically (every few months) a summary of comments should be posted on the Web for all to see.
- Web-based evaluation forms could also be designed to collect additional comments from those using the web site; and
- Someone other than DOE-RL should design, sponsor and collect forms.

A table of public involvement values, goals, and attributes was compiled from several sources. This synthesis is intended to provide an integrated framework for the content of evaluations. In other words, what is important (*values*) and how to measure it (*performance metrics*).

Values	Goals/Objectives	Attributes	Performance Metrics
Productive and Effective Public Involvement Activity: Pre-activity actions	Flexible style and format for meetings (design, layout, language)	meetings, focus groups, workshops, briefings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is there a variety of public involvement activities e.g., meetings, focus groups, conference calls and number of comments received? - Number of non-agency people attending - Number of non-agency people filling out evaluations - variety of activities : at least three kinds for major decisions
		In depth info briefings	Number of briefings/attendance
		Focus groups	Number of briefings/attendance
		Work sessions	Number of briefings/attendance
		Civic group presentations	Number of briefings/attendance
		Conference calls	Number of calls and attendance

Values	Goals/Objectives	Attributes	Performance Metrics
	<p>Determine goals of public involvement activity prior to the activity (e.g., to inform the public, to get input on a process or decision, or to get feedback on a particular document).</p> <p>Work with states and stakeholders to decide what P.I. activity will meet goals.</p>	(see also meeting materials)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are goals specified in meeting materials? (yes/no) - Agenda and fact sheet or briefing paper provided before meeting/focus group or phone call? (yes/no)
<i>Use creative and innovative ways to get info to the public.</i>	Effective advertising process (links to more targeted audience and is less costly).	Newspaper calendar of events	Number of advertising mechanisms used to get info out to public.
		Internet	Is it used effectively?
		Response cards/flyers	Used at every meeting?
		Direct mailings Call trees	Used ?
		Editorial boards	Used?
		Radio releases & public broadcasting stations	Used?
		Posters	Used?
	Notification strategy	Sufficient advance notice	Time elapsed between notices and meetings
		Adequate (advertising) coverage	Number of advertising mechanisms used
		Route all TPA meeting requests/notifications through one OEA individual	Is the OEA contact person notified of all events? (yes/no) When?
		Notify at least a standard list of interested parties	Is the standard list used? (yes/no)
	Timing of public involvement	Involve public from the outset	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are all points of public involvement defined? (yes/no) - Are they planned so as to allow maximum impact on the process?

Values	Goals/Objectives	Attributes	Performance Metrics
		Provide feedback and evidence of how comments applied	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do meeting summaries include comments and responses? (yes/no) - Are they adequate? (yes/no) - Is there a clear mechanism to respond to public comment?
	Provide appropriate meeting materials	Provide sufficient information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - percent public satisfied with info received (get percentage from cards. - Is an agenda provided? - Are goals provided in the materials? - Is a list of participants provided? - Contact names and numbers identified?
		Clear, Concise, Understandable	percent of public satisfied (from cards) and review by annual review team
		Focused on easy reading standards	percent of public satisfied (from cards) and review by annual review team
	Effective speakers	Knowledgeable	percent of public satisfied (from cards) and review by annual review team
		Sensitive to different views	percent of public satisfied (from cards) and review by annual review team
		Use little jargon	percent of public satisfied (from cards) and review by annual review team
		Generally brief; providing more time for interaction	percent of public satisfied (from cards) and review by annual review team
		Well prepared	percent of public satisfied (from cards) and review by annual review team
		Sensitive to views and opinions of the public	percent of public satisfied (from cards) and review by annual review team.
	Effective leadership	Leaders show a willingness to listen	percent of public satisfied (from cards) and review by annual review team
		Leaders show willingness to apply public input to decisions where applicable (link to credibility)	By annual review team
		Allow opportunities for public feedback	percent of public satisfied (from cards) and review by annual review team

Values	Goals/Objectives	Attributes	Performance Metrics
		Allow question and answer period.	percent of public satisfied (from cards) and review by annual review team.
		Keep agency personnel and contractors to a minimum	# of agency & contractor personnel participating; Ratio of agency to general public/stakeholders
	Effective moderators and facilitators	Adequately trained	percent agreeing facilitators are effective and annual review team
		Convenient to public transportation	percent responding on cards.
		Good sound system	percent responding on cards
		Good room setup	percent responding on cards
		Adequate/convenient parking	percent responding on cards
		Videotaping/tape recording	Annual review team
		Convene activities in appropriate geographic location	Annual review team
	Good Attendance	Effective prior notification and advertising.	Number of non agency attendees. Ratio of agency to general public/stakeholders
		Convene activities in appropriate geographic location	Are all appropriate locations used? (y/n)
Productive and Effective Public Involvement Activity: Post Activity	Timely feedback after meetings	One-pager defines problem, summarizes comments, explains DOE actions, answers FAQ's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the feedback provided within 30-60 days? - Is it generally responsive to comments?
		mailed to all who sign up	Mailed to sign up list (y/n)
		put on web	Put on web (y/n)
Cost effective public involvement activity	Use efficient advertising	See suggestions above	\$ spent on advertising
	Minimize number of agency staff and contractors		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - \$ spent on lodging for agency personnel - number of agency personnel attending and ratio to public.

Values	Goals/Objectives	Attributes	Performance Metrics
	Work with local individuals to secure low cost meeting rooms	30-60 days advanced notice helps secure low-cost facilities	Time elapsed between first notice and meeting date
	Maintain cost effective public involvement budget		Review of costs for specific public involvement efforts (\$)

Sources

- Hanford TPA Community Relations Plan, PI Evaluation Process Section. (Page 5)
- Letters from Oregon Office of Energy to DOE-RL from 1994-1998
- DOE-RL Public Involvement Policy (October 1997)
- DOE-RL Public Involvement Desk Reference (October 1997)
- HOW 1998 Report
- Letter to Secretary Peña, November 14, 1997 (and attached presentation summary)

The decision analysis literature often advocates organizing values. This may be a useful approach for the Public Involvement activities. The information used is based on the information received from DOE-RL and OR Energy.

Definitions

Values are something about which a person cares deeply, generally a broad, abstract statement that cross-cuts different contexts.

Goals articulate a particular value in a given context; i.e., tells what is desired in a given situation.

Objectives specify a specific level of attainment that is sought for a given goal.

Criteria are units of measurement that allow us to evaluate tradeoffs. More simply, criteria are attributes that have been valued as, for example, 'good' or 'bad', as in "more meetings are better than fewer meetings".

Attributes describe the character of the particular problem or issue at hand. Attributes are not considered to be 'valued' in this framework because they are merely descriptive; they have not been categorized as 'good' or 'bad'. Attributes are sometimes complex and thus categories of sub-attributes are often useful.

Performance Metrics. Once attributes are defined, performance metrics can be easily identified for each criterion. Expected benefits of this method are ensuring that each value or goal is directly linked to a performance measure and a fuller understanding of the value framework that underpins each performance metric.